University of Sarajevo

Faculty of Philosophy

English Department

Negation in the period of Modern English /

Negacija u periodu modernog engleskog

MA thesis

Supervisor: dr. Nataša Stojaković   **Student: Ardisa Poturković**

Sarajevo, 2016

Abstract

The main goal of this paper is to show how the system of negation functions during Modern English. For that purpose, the previous periods in the history of English and the features concerning the English negation system will be analyzed.

The usage and development of English negation are shown through examples taken from plays published in the 17th, 19th and 21st centuries. These plays are used to show different features of negation and its course of development through different periods. The first is Shakespeare's *Hamlet,* as part of Early Modern English with a different system of negation than is known today.

Baillie's *The Second Marriage* and Stephenson's *Mappa Mundi* are the other two dramas, taken from the early 19th and 21st centuries, and they are mainly used to show the way the negation system has changed and how it functions today.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Negation is a very complex and at the same time basic phenomenon of human language which demands a lot of attention and effort when it comes to its system of functioning. This paper will deal with the system of negation in Modern English (ModE).

In order to show how English negation functions today, previous periods have to be mentioned. Thus, this paper starts with a short historical background which includes the periods of Old English (OE) and Middle English (ME). The negation system was quite different during these two periods, and their features will help us to become aware of differences that occurred over time in English and its system of negation.

Modern English comprises the periods of Early Modern English (EModE) from 1500 to 1650, Late Modern English from 1650 to 1800 and Present-day English (PdE) from 1800 to today. (Baugh and Cable 1993) These periods reflect different features of negation and show the changing path of it.

William Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, written about 1599-1601, is used to show which negators and negative connectives were used in EModE, which word order was dominant in this period, by what means the negation is strengthened, the notion of Negative Concord (NC) and how these features modeled and influenced the negation system today.

The 18th century is marked by the standardization of the English language, which brought great changes to the system of negation. The use of NC, i.e. multiple negation, is considered as a symbol of poor education and the use of nonassertive forms leads to a complete loss of multiple negation. (Kallel 2007) In addition to this, the rise of auxiliary *do* brought new forms in negative, interrogative and imperative sentences.

ModE negation will be analyzed from the aspect of clause negation (the meaning of a whole clause is negative) and local negation (only a word or a phrase is negative) through Joanna Baillie's *The Second Marriage* (1821) and Shelagh Stephenson's *Mappa Mundi* (2002). In this analysis a number of negators and their use will be mentioned as well. Also, negation of negative connectives, negative indefinite pronouns, negative questions, and affixal negation will help us to understand the phenomenon of negation and its function.

2. Historical background

> In many ways, negation is what makes us human, imbuing us with the capacity to deny, to contradict, to misrepresent, to lie, and to convey irony. (Horn 2010: 1)

Mazzon (2004:1) states that "[n]egation is a basic phenomenon of human language which is common to all human languages and it is capable of taking a variety of different forms". Negative expressions underwent numerous changes throughout the history of the English language. The OE negative particle *ne* was first weakened and then considered to be insufficient. After this period the necessity to attach an additional word in order to strengthen the negative meaning was logical. Also, there was a tendency to place the negative at the beginning of the sentence or at least right before the word to be negative, which has been drastically changed by placing the subject of a sentence first. In order to provide a detailed description of negation in Modern English, previous periods and their characteristics have to be discussed briefly.

2.1. Jespersen's cycle

Before analyzing each period of the history of English from the aspect of negation, it is important to mention Jespersen's detailed study of negation in English and other languages (1917), which presents a phenomenon well known under the term Jespersen's cycle. Mazzon (2004:5) describes that "Jespersen observes a cyclic nature in the development of negative elements. It consists of successive phases of weakening and reinforcing of the formal means of expressing main sentential negation". Jaspersen's Cycle includes the following stages:

I   negation is expressed by single pre-verbal negative marker (*ne*)

II   negation is expressed by a negative marker in combination with a negative adverb or noun phrase (*ne... not*; *ne... no*)

III   the second element in stage II takes on the function of expressing negation by itself; the original negative marker becomes optional (*ne...not*)

IV the original negative marker becomes extinct (*not*)

V introduction of *do* (*do not*)

VI contraction of *do not = don't* (Mazzon 2004: 5)

2.2. Old English (OE)

Old English comprises the period from the 5th to the 11th centuries. One of the most distinctive features of OE in comparison to modern English is its system of negation. It is characterized by "richness of the negation system and the existence of various subsystems, although one (i.e. pre-verbal particle) is numerically predominant over the others" (Mazzon 2004: 28).

Negation in OE is expressed by the simple particle *ne,* which is either attached to the word that is supposed to be negatived or placed before verbs. Also, this simple particle *ne* usually appears at the beginning of a sentence and there is no sign of a dummy auxiliary verb which we encounter today. One of the most important features of Old English negation is that the particle *ne* usually appears before finite verbs but it also attaches itself to other suitable indefinite pronouns or quantifiers. Although *ne* is the main sentence negator up until Middle English, other negative words appear too, i.e. the negative coordinator *nor*, which functions in the same way as *ne,* negator *ne/no* with various functions, *nahwar* with the meaning of 'nowhere', *nateshwon* as 'in no way' etc. (Mazzon 2004:29).

The main negative element was preverbal *ne*, and the adding of extra negators is optional and it is used predominately for emphasis. These negators are repeated on all elements which are able to take them. Therefore such repetitions are not used to cancel each other out but to make the negative meaning of the sentence even more emphatic. This phenomenon is known as 'negative concord' or 'multiple negation' (Jaspersen 1917: 62), which is also encountered in later periods of English. Additionally, "the rule of 'negative attraction', i.e. the attachment of a negative morpheme to the first possible element in a clause" (Jespersen 1917: 66), is not as strictly followed in OE as it is today. In contrast to Modern English in which the clause and constituent negation is expressed by the negator of the same form, in OE the clause negator and the constituent negator did not have the same form. The problem of negation is related to other

questions such as word order. In OE there was no dominant word order; however there was a tendency for SVO word order. (1917: 67)

2.3. Middle English (ME)

The period covered in this part of the paper is Middle English, which lasted from the 12th to the late 15th century and is considered as a period of significant change.

The system of negative constructions in ME can be observed from two different aspects. The first one is the syntactic use of *ne, ne...not, not* as negative markers and the second one is the phenomenon of 'negative concord'. (Mazzon 2004: 36)

Middle English negative constructions are marked by the adverbs *ne, not, never, no...* etc. and negative conjunctions such as *neither, ne/nor* and their different combinations. The particle *ne* was used in Early Middle English and was gradually supplemented by the adverb *not.* This was a transitional period of *ne...not* combination which was considered rather unstable throughout ME. In fact, it looks as if adverbs *ne* and *not* competed with each other in the later period of ME. Co-existence of the adverb *ne* with *never, no...* etc. was popular in Early Middle English but it becomes less and less popular in Later Middle English due to the decline of the adverb *ne* itself. However, the combination of *not* with *never, no...* etc. is rarely used throughout the Middle English period because *not* is predominantly used as an element to strengthen the negative force. (Frisch 1997)

During the period of ME Negative-Concord (NC) becomes obligatory. NC or multiple negation reaches its peak in the period of ME but also undergoes the decline in the later period. Multiple negation undergoes decline due to the decline of the particle *ne* itself which happens in the 15th century. Also, replacement of the conjunction *ne/nor* by *and/or* and development of non-assertive forms *any* and *ever* instead of *never, no*, etc. conditioned the decline of multiple negation. Although the multiple negation declines during the ME period, it does not disappear completely. (Kallel 2007)

There is another feature of negation in ME called Negative Raising which, although was used sparsely in OE, it became acknowledged and more clearly defined in the period of ME. Mazzon

8

(2004:39) defines it as "a rule according to which the negative element is moved out from a subordinate to the main clause, with verbs such as *think, want* etc".

Prefixes such as *dis-*, *un-*, *de-* come into the use during ME.

3. The System of Negation in Modern English (ModE)

3.1. Early Modern English (EModE)

The period of EModE is the period from the late 15th to the late 17th century. The period is characterized by great political, cultural and linguistic changes. The separation from France caused the dominance of English over French. Also, the English language becomes dominant over Latin too, but Latin was still used in some aspects of life. The development of printing in Britain which took place in the late 15th century influenced the standardization and spreading of some forms. Late ME and EModE are usually considered as periods "in which the normal rate of change was often accelerated so much as to look like a revolution." (Mazzon 2004: 54)

In order to explain negative features dominant in this period, Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is used to provide examples.

3.1.1. Negators in Shakespeare's English (ShE)

There are a lot of negators used in Shakespeare. In the course of this paper negators such as *not, never, no, none, nothing, neither, nor* and many others will be discussed.

3.1.1.1. Not

During the period of EModE, the negator *not* was the most common, and its frequent use is shown in ShE too. At the time, *not* could occupy two different positions, i.e. after and before the verb. The following example shows its position after the verb:

(1) *In what particular thought to work I know **not**.* (Shakespeare 1885:4)

However, there are no examples found in *Hamlet* which would show the postion of *not* before the verb.

Also, it is usual that *not* appears after the object, especially when the object is a pronoun.

(2) *Yet he knew me **not** at first; 'a said I was a fishmonger.* (Shakespeare 1885: 38)

According to Blake (2002: 208), the negator *not* is never used in its contracted form *n't*. However, it is frequently surrounded by abbreviated forms, which makes it completely different from Modern English where forms such as *don't* appear.

(3) *Am I **not** i'th' right, old Jepthah?* (Shakespeare 1885: 44)

(4) *Let her **not** walk i' th' sun.* (Shakespeare 1885: 38)

Not can be used in combination with *may* thus reflecting the meaning *must not*. (Abbot 1883: 220)

(5) *He **may not**, as unvalued persons do,*
    *Carve for himself... (*Shakespeare 1885: 15)

3.1.1.2. Never

Although in Modern English *never* appears before the main verb, after modal verbs and the verb *to be*, in ShE the situation is somewhat different. *Never* precedes the main verb as it can be seen in the example below:

(6) *I **never** gave you aught.* (Shakespeare 1885: 52)

The negator *never* is found in sentences preceding modal verbs and following the verb *to be*.

(7) *He **never** will come again;* (Shakespeare 1885: 88)

(8) *I heard thee speak me a speech once but it was **never** acted; or if it was, not above once...* (Shakespeare 1885: 45)

This last example also shows that *never* is sometimes used instead of *not*. Thus, the line '*but it was never acted'* can be rightfully interpreted as *'but it wasn't acted'*. Similar example of *never*, being used as the negator *not*, can be observed in example (6), i.e. *I never gave you aught = I didn't give you aught*.

As in Present-day English words appear in their reduced or contracted forms. The contracted forms in ShE are often the same as those used today, but there are some difference as it can be seen in the following example

(9) *Nor sense to ecstasy was **ne'er** so thrall'd...* (Shakespeare 1885:72)

3.1.1.3. Nothing

Nothing is an indefinite pronoun which has the meaning *'no way', 'not'*.

(10*) ...Will **nothing** stick our person to arraign*

   In ear and ear. (Shakespeare 1885: 85)

In ShE *nothing* functions either adverbially or as a pronoun, which can be seen in the following examples.

(11) HAMLET

   The body is with the King, but the King
   Is not with the body. The King is a thing-
   GUILDENSTERN
   A thing, my lord!
   HAMLET
   *Of **nothing**. Bring me to him.* (Shakespeare 1885:78)

(12) *Why, then, 'tis none to you; for there is*
   ***nothing** either good or bad, but thiking makes*
   it so. To me it is a prison. (Shakespeare 1885: 40)

3.1.1.4. No

No functions both as a determiner and as an adverb, and in ShE it serves as an alternative to *not*, and with that function it usually precedes a noun which can be seen in the following example:

(13) There needs **no** *ghost, my lord, come*

    From the grave

    To tell us this. (Shakespeare 1885: 26)

Or an adjective:

(14) *There is* **no** *ancient gentlemen but gar'ners,*

    Ditchers, and grave-makers; they hold up

    Adam's profession (Shakespeare 1885:95)

Also, the determiner *no* is used in conditions and in opposition to affirmations: (Blake 2002: 208)

(15) *But let me conjure you by the rights of our fellowship, by*

    The consonancy of our youth, by the obligation

    Of our ever-preserved love, and by what more

    Dear a better proposer can charge you withal, be

    Even and direct with me, whether you were sent for or **no***?* (Shakespeare 1885: 41)

In ShE, a lot of examples of *nay* can be encountered. *Nay* also functions as an adverb and it can be seen from examples below that the meaning of 'nay' and 'no' is almost the same.

(16) HAMLET

    O God, your only jig-maker! What

    should man do but be merry? For look you

    how cheerfully my mother looks, and my father

    died within's two hours.

    OPHELIA

    Nay*, 'tis twice two months, my lord.* (Shakespeare 1885: 58)

3.1.1.5. None

It should be pointed out that the negator *no* has developed from *none*. *None* is used for 'not at all', 'nothing' or 'not'.

(17) SECOND CLOWN

Was he a gentleman?
FIRST CLOWN
A'was the first that ever bore arms.
SECOND CLOWN
*Why, he had **none**.* (Shakespeare 1885: 97)

(18) *...What forgeries you please; marry, **none** so rank*
As may dishonor him; (Shakespeare 1885:29)

In example 18 *none* functions as *not* whereas in example 19 *none* bears the meaning of *nothing* which means that the phrase could be interpreted as *'*nothing too bad that it would shame him*'*.

None may denote either persons or things. If it denotes persons, it is equivalent to the more usual *nobody* or *no one,* and it if it denotes things, it is equivalent to *nothing*. (Poutsma 1916: 1155)

In the following example *none* denotes persons which equalizes its meaning with the meaning of *no one* or *nobody.*

(19) *O, confound the rest!*
Such love must needs be treason to my breast.
In second husband let me be accurst!

***None** wed the second but who kill'd the first.* (Shakespeare 1885:60)

It can be used elliptically instead of *not*, usually at the end of clauses. (Blake 2002:209)

(20) HAMLET
Did you speak to it?
HORATIO
My lord, I did;

*But answer made it **none***; (Shaespeare 1885: 13)

3.1.1.6. Neither

By definition *neither* has a meaning 'none of two', i.e. not one and not the other. It is used as a "distributive numeral or as a conjunctive adverb". (Poutsma 1916: 1126)

(21) *GUILDENSTERN*

   Happy in that we are not over-happy;

   On fortune's cap we are not the very button.

   HAMLET

   Nor the soles of her shoes

   ROSENCRANTZ

   ***Neither,** my lord.* (Shakespeare 1885: 39)

3.1.1.7. Nor

Nor functions as a conjunction or as an adverb. Its primary function is to join two sentences which is shown below:

(22) *I would not hear your enemy say so;*

   ***Nor** shall you do my ear that violence,*

   To make it truster of your own report

   Against yourself. (Shakespeare 1885: 12)

Although *nor* has the negative meaning 'and not', *not* itself and other negators are usually included in the clause along with *nor*.

(23) *'Tis **not** alone my inky cloak, good mother,*

   ***Nor** customery suits of solemn black,...* (Shakespeare 1885: 9)

(24) *... **No** fairy takes, **nor** witch hath power to charm...* (Shakespeare 1885: 6)

The repetition of *nor* can usually appear before noun phrases rather than at the front of clauses. (Blake 2002: 209)

(25) *'Tis not alone my inky cloak, good mother,*

Nor customary suits of solemn black,

Nor windy suspiration of forc'd breath,

No, **nor** the fruitful river in the eye,

Nor the dejected haviour of the visage... (Shakespeare 1885: 9)

During the period of EModE *nor* could be replaced by *not* and this could happen in combination with another negator which would occur in the final position. However, no such examples are found in Hamlet.

3.1.1.8. Neither...nor

The combination of *neither…nor* is used in a sentence with the negative sense if we want to show that two or more things are not true. Also, it is used to join two negative ideas which is shown in the example below.

(26) **Neither** a borrower **nor** a lender be;

For loan oft loses both itself and friend...   (Shakespeare 1885: 17)

(27) ...that, **neither** having th' accent of

Christian, pagan, **nor** the giat of

Christian, pagan…   (Shakespeare 1885: 56)

3.1.1.9. Other words used as negators

In ShE other words are also used as negators, which in Present-day English do not have pure negative meaning either. These words include *hardly, scarce(ly)* and *seldom.*

(28) ... *Who, impotent and bed-rid,* **scarcely** *hears*

Of this his nephew's purpose...   (Shakespeare 1885: 8)

(29) *...that many wearing rapiers are afraid*

Of goose quills and dare **scarce** *come*

thither. (Shakespeare 1885: 42)

However, examples of other words carrying negative meaning such as *hardly* and *seldom* are not found in *Hamlet*.

3.1.1.10. Negators as determiners

Negators can function as determiners or predeterminers within the noun group. Also, they can occur before comparative adjective. (Blake 2002: 213)

(30) *Let me be **no** assistant for a state...* (Shakespeare 1885: 37)

(31) *Will they pursue the quality **no** longer than they can sing? (*Shakespeare 1885: 42)

According to PdE rules, there is a tendency to front the negator into the main clause while the subordinate clause is in fact negative. (Blake 2002: 215) Such use is present in ShE and it can be seen in the following example:

(32) *You must **not** think*
      That we are made of stuff so flat and dull
      That we can let our beard be shook with danger,
      And think it pastime. (Shakespeare 1885: 91)

However, there are many examples in which negators appear in subordinate clause too, which is shown in example 33:

(33) *I think it be **no** other but e'en so.* (Shakespeare 1885: 6)

In PdE the phrase *at all* is restricted to negatives and this is the case in ShE too, although not as strict as it is today. In ShE it can occur with negatives, verbs or prepositions which have a negative quality.

(34) Why, right; you are in the right;
      *And so, without more circumstance **at all**…* (Shakespeare 1885: 26)

3.1.2. Affixes with negative meaning

EModE is a period in which negative prefixes multiply since the whole period is marked by enhancement of the English lexicon. ShE is one of the best examples to show this. However, the meaning of the derived word is the opposite of the simple word rather than a negative which will be discussed in the course of the paper. (Blake 2002: 214) There are a lot of examples of the prefix *un-*, which may vary with *in-*, as in *Hamlet*.

(35) ***Un**equal match'd,... (*Shakespeare 1885: 45)

(36) *Th' **un**nerved father falls… (*Shakespeare 1885: 46)

(37) *Will so bestow ourselves that, seeing **un**seen… (*Shakespeare 1885: 50*)*

(38) *It is **in**different cold, my lord, indeed.* (Shakespeare 1885: 108)

(39) *For it is, as the air, **in**vulnerable ... (*Shakespeare 1885: 6)

These prefixes were actually competing with each other over every word, and their dominance depended on 'lexical diffusion' (Mazzon 2004: 74), i.e. each prefix had to conquer its territory. Among other prefixes, *dis-* and *de-* should be mentioned, and the suffix *−less*.

(40) *...Or thinking by our late dear brother's death*
    *Our state to be **dis**joint and out of frame,...* (Shakespeare 1885: 7)

(41) *The graves stood tenant**less**… (*Shakespeare 1885: 5)

3.1.3. Tag questions

A tag question is in fact a short question that follows a statement. They are usually formed with auxiliaries. Positive tag questions can be used to emphasize the negative idea and vice versa. Also, it is possible to have a positive tag after a positive statement, which may be considered ironic. Such tags are used in informal language. Also, the negative is usually abbreviated to *n't*. This is the case in PdE, which will be discussed later but it has to be mentioned since tags in ShE are quite different. As it is mentioned earlier in the paper, there isn't an abbreviated form of *not* in ShE, thus it *isn't* used in tags either.

17

According to Blake (2002: 212) ShE includes various combinations such as negative tags after a positive statement, negative clauses with a positive tag, positive tag after a postive clause and negative tags after a negative clause. However, the only combination that occurs in Hamlet is a negative tag with a positive statement which can be seen in the following example:

(42) *This might be the pate of a politician,*

    Which this ass now o'erreaches; one that would

    Circumvent God, **might it not?** (Shakespeare 1885: 99)

3.1.4. The strengthening of negation

There are various ways to strengthen negatives. The most frequent way is accomplished by adding some element, usually another negator or some word or a phrase. By doing this the basic goal is to make the negative meaning stronger and more emphatic.

The most usual form used for the purpose of strengthening negation is the inclusion of *neither* towards the end, or *nor* at the beginning of a clause.

(43) **Nor** *customary suits of solemn black,*

    Nor *windy suspiration of for'd breath,*

    No, nor *the fruitful river in the eye,*

    Nor *the dejacted haviour of the visage.* (Shakespeare 1885: 9)

(44) *FIRST CLOWN*

    For **no** *man, sir.*

   HAMLET

   What woman, then

   FIRST CLOWN

   For **none neither***.* (Shakespeare 1885:100)

Also, the combination of these two can be encountered as it can be seen in the following example.

(45) *Man delights* **not** *me-*

   No, nor *woman* **neither***, though by*

   Your smiling you seem to say so. (Shakespeare 1885: 41)

Strengthening can be achieved through repetition of the negative word or phrase too.

(46) *You are* **naught,** *you are* **naught.** (Shakespeare 1885: 59)

(47) *And will a' not come again?*

   And will 'a not come again?

   No, no*, he is dead: (*Shakespeare 1885: 88)

Also, inclusion of some phrase as an intesifier after the negator can serve the purpose of strengthening.

(48) **No***, faith,* **not a jot***; but to follow him... (*Shakespeare 1868: 102)

However, the strengthening word or phrase can be separated from the negator.

(49) **No, no***; they do but jest; poison in jest;*

   No offence *i' th' world. (*Shakespeare 1885: 62)

3.1.5. Word order in ShE

If there is a negator within the clause the usual word order is SUBJECT + VERB + NEGATOR (+ OBJECT) as it can be observed below: (Blake 2002: 210)

(50) *Man delights* **not** *me…* (Shakespeare 1885: 41)

The use of auxiliaries with negative expressions could occur, but was not yet grammaticalised. (Blake 2002: 210) If an auxiliary verb appears in a clause, the word order is SUBJECT + AUXILIARY + NEGATOR + VERB (+ OBJECT)

(51) *It will* **not** *speak...* (Shakespeare 1885: 21)

NEGATOR+SUBJECT+AUXILIARY+VERB

Examples with such word order are not found in Hamlet.

However, other combinations are possible especially with interrogatives, imperatives or in subordinate clauses.

AUXILIARY+NEGATOR (+SUBJECT) +VERB

(52) *Do **not** believe his vows...* (Shakespeare 1885: 18)

VERB+NEGATOR+SUBJECT/OBJECT

(53) *...Show me the steep and thorny way to heaven,*

   Whiles, like a puff'd and reckless libertine,

   Himself the primrose path of dalliance treads

   *And recks **not** his own rede.* (Shakespeare 1885: 16)

(AUXILIARY)+SUBJECT+NEGATOR+VERB

 (54) *Else could you **not** have motion... (*Shakespeare 1885: 72)

NEGATOR+VERB+OBJECT

(55) ***Not** to crack the wind of the poor phrase...* (Shakespeare 1885: 18)

VERB+OBJECT+NEGATOR

(56) *... yet he knew me **not** at first... (*Shakespeare 1885: 38)

 3.1.6. Negative Concord (NC) and its decline

The operation of NC is the use of two or more negative elements that do not cancel each other but are used to emphasize the negative meaning. (Kallel 2007) This is also known under the term multiple negation. This phenomenon is one of the most striking features of the development of English negation which regularly occurs in the periods of OE, ME and EModE. However, PdE is not characterized by multiple negation except in some dialects of non-standard English. (Kallel 2007)

As already mentioned, earlier stages of English are characterized by the phenomenon of multiple negation, i.e. double negation, triple negation...etc. A brief discussion on the use of multiple negation during OE and ME is included in the section 'Historical Background'.

Although NC declines during the period of ME, it does not disappear completely and the examples of this phenomenon can be found in the later period. The main reason of the decline is that at the end of ME and the beginning of EModE, pre-verbal *ne* becomes optional and negative constituents seem to be able to negate themselves. (Kallel 2007)

However, examples of multiple negation can be found during EModE. In fact ME and EModE speakers use both single and multiple negation to express or to intensify the negative meaning. In EModE, speakers had an alternative either to use non-assertive forms, so called *any*-words, in a place where n-words occur, or to use simply n-words.

Otto Jespersen discusses the instances of multiple negation in which two negatives either make an affirmative or two repeated negatives make a negative. (Jespersen 1917: 63) The first instance is considered to be a universal rule in all languages if two negatives are related to the same word. In these cases *not* is usually used before some word of negative import or consisting of negative prefix. Jespersen states (1917: 63) that the double negative always modiefies the idea, and the result of the whole expression is different from the simple idea expressed positively.

Within the second instance in which two repeated negatives make a negative, different classes of negation can be observed such as:

- double attraction
- resumptive negation
- paratactic negation

However, most features of multiple negation are not found in *Hamlet*. Reasons for this may be various. The period itself is considered to be a period in which multiple negation declines and the use of non-assertive forms such as *any* and *ever* instead of *no* and *never* and *or* instead of *nor* was present but not yet grammaticalised which sometimes caused multiple negation. Additionally, *Hamlet* itself is relatively short piece of literurte so it does not contain numerous examples of multiple negation.

3.1.6.1. Double Attraction

Throughout the history of the English language, there were tendencies either to place the negative to the verb or to attach a negative element to a word which can receive a negative prefix. These tendencies were used separately but here is the example in which both tendencies are used at the same time and the result is the sentence with double or even multiple negation, and this is labled as double attraction.

This was common in OE but repeated negation becomes rarer when the negative *not* is established. So, there are a lot of instances of such repetitions in OE and EME, but in ShE such repetitions are rather rare. "In Elizabethan English this kind of repeated negation is comparatively rare; from Sh. I have only two instances." (Jespersen 1917: 65) None of these two is found in *Hamlet*.

3.1.6.2. Resumptive Negation

The basic feature of this class is that after a negative sentence has been completed, something is added in a negative form in order to intensify the negative effect. The most frequent examples of resumptive negation are when *not* is followed by *neither...nor*: (Jespersen 1917: 73)

(57) GUILDENSTERN

    Happy in that we are not over-happy;
    *On fortune's cap we are **not** the very button.*
    HAMLET
    ***Nor** the soles of her shoe?*
    ROSENCRANTZ
    ***Neither**, my lord. (*Shakespeare 1885: 39)

A special case of resumptive negation is the combination of the word *hardly* with the preceding negative word. However, in previous sections, it is mentioned that the negator *hardly* is not found in *Hamlet*, thus this combination does not appear in *Hamlet* either.
The negator *scarcely* after a negative or after the word *without* or other indirect negatives is another case of resumptive negation. No examples are found in Hamlet.

3.1.6.3. Paratactic Negation

This type is closely related to resumptive negation. "A negative is placed in a clause dependant on a verb of negative import like *'deny, forbid, hinder, doubt'*. The clause is treated as an independent clause and the negative is expressed as if there had been no main sentence of that particular kind." (Jespersen 1917: 75) Examples of this type are not found in *Hamlet*.

3.1.6.4. The loss of multiple negation

The phenomenon of multiple negation was present up until the 18th century. This century is considered as the period of great changes during which the process of standardization finally began. (Kallel 2007)

Up until the 18th century, Latin was the language used in all aspects of life (school, commerce etc.) but English started to substitute it slowly. Under the influence of Latin which had an unchanging grammar system, it was logical that English had to become a legitimate language with grammar system that will stop the language from changing. (Mazzon 2004: 91) Since the process of standardization began, prescriptive grammars emerged and thus influenced the complete loss of NC. Although this is considered to be the main cause for the disappearance of NC ('two negatives make a positive'), the truth is that it started declining much earlier as it is stated in Mazzon's book:

> What is certain is that multiple negation in written English appears to grow rarer and rarer much earlier than the time when it was attacked by prescriptive grammarians, and that only occasional, stray occurrences appear in the eighteenth century. As mentioned several times, therefore, the statement that is often found to the effect that multiple negation was excluded from the standard as a consequence of the grammarians' attacks (...) is not correct, since the phenomenon had been on its way out of this variety for some time already.'
> (Mazzon 2004: 63)

From this period on, the use of multiple negation is considered as a symbol of poor education. Today, multiple negation is used in some dialects of non-standard English such as Gutter Scots, Appalachian English and African American Vernacular English.

The double negative that is acceptable in Standard English is the use of *not f*ollowed by prefix *un-* which will be mentioned later.

3.*1.7. The development of auxiliary* **do** *in negative sentences*

One of the most important aspects of English syntax is the development of auxiliary *do*. According to the article published by Varela Pérez in 1997 this took place in ME and EModE, but not until the 18th had *do* become an obligatory element in accordance with the English grammar system. From the 15th century onwards a new form with auxiliary *do* developed in negative, interrogative and imperative sentences where no other auxiliary tensed verb was present. Throughout the period of EModE there was a choice between negating with auxiliary *do* followed by the particle *not* preceding the main verb, as it is in PdE, or negating with the adverbial form *not* following the verb. Both options can be found in ShE:

(58) *I pray thee, do **not** mock me, fellow*

   *student; (*Shakespeare 1885: 12)

(59) *...I know **not**... (*Shakespeare 1885:9*)*

Also, there was one more option which is treated as a transition between these two stages and it involves the use of *not* before the verb (Varela Pérez 1997), but such examples are not found in Hamlet.

The following table shows the numbers of these structures in *Hamlet* in order to show their presence or abscance.

V+Not	Not+V	Do+not+V
80 examples found	No examples found	36 examples found

So, all the three options, i.e. negation with auxiliary *do* followed by *not* which precedes the main verb, negation with the adverbial form *not* which follows the verb and the transitional option are present in *ShE*. However, as stated earlier, from the late 17th century *do* has become the obligatory element, and thus the first option is now the only one appropriate. D*o-support* is required in questions, negative declaratives for lexical verbs, but prohibited for *be* and auxiliary verbs and it is prohibited in affirmative declaratives. (Han and Kroch 1999: 1) The use of auxiliary *do* in PdE will be shown through examples from the two plays from the early 19th and 20th centuries.

The following example is taken from the 19th century play and it is used to show the presence of auxiliary *do*.

(60) *Well there is something here I **don't** understand.* (Baillie 1821: 372)

However, this play also shows that the previous word order, i.e. without auxiliary *do* is still used though not as widely as before.

(61) *I looked **not** for her so soon…* (Baillie 1821: 378)

Examples taken from the 21st century play demonstrate that the first option, i.e. *do* followed by *not* which precedes the main verb, is the only one appropriate.

(62) *I'm talking about England. I **don't** know anything about Antarctica.* (Stephenson 2002: 4)

The table below shows an overview of the different systems of negation throughout the history (Varela Pérez 1997):

OE	ME	EModE	ModE
Ne+V	ne+V	V+not	Do+not+V
	Ne+V+not	not+V	
		Do+not+V	

The rise of auxiliary *do* has developed gradually and took place at different rates. There are various factors which influenced the rise of auxiliary *do*. It is stated that modification of one structural element often causes the change of other components in a language. This is what happened with this phenomenon. The existing pattern of auxiliary verbs, word order change and the placement of indefinite adverbs in pre-verbal position influenced the emergence of *do*-support. (Varela Pérez 1997) The emergence and the development of auxiliary *do* appeared much more rapidly in interrogative sentences than in negative declaratives because there was no such pressure to adapt to the new word order in negative sentences.

3.1.7.1. The auxiliary **do** *in negative clauses with the transitive verb* **have**

The transitive verb *have* has a number of possible negative forms. There are five main types (Douglas, Johansson, Conrad & Finegan 1999: 160):

• *Not*-negation, lexical verb construction (with *do*)

(63) *She **didn't** have much choice, she was dead.* (Stephenson 2002: 77)

• *Not*-negation, auxiliary-like construction

(64) *You have **not** a word to say...* (Baillie 1821: 405)

(65) *I **haven't** a clue.* (Stephenson 2002: 32)

• *Not*-negation, *have got*

(66) ***Haven't** you got any interesting facts to tell me?* (Stephenson 2002: 39)

 • *No*-negation, *have*

(67) *Let us have **no** more of this nonsense.* (Baillie 1821: 383)

(68) *I had **no** idea about any of this stuff.* (Stephenson 2002: 10)

• *No*-negation, (*have*) *got*

No such examples found.

3.1.7.2. The auxiliary do in negative clauses with the semi-modal have to

The semi-modal has three forms in negative clauses i.e. the lexical verb construction (with *do*), auxiliary construction (without *do*) and *have got to*. (Douglas et al. 1999: 162) However, examples that reflect the use of these features are rare; only examples reflecting the first feature of the semi-modal *have to* are found:

(69) *I don't have to sit through it to find out.* (Stephenson 2002: 70)

3.1.7.3. The auxiliary do in negative clauses with dare and need

The verbs *dare* and *need* have two forms in negative clauses, i.e. the lexical verb construction (with *do*) - no examples found and auxiliary construction (without *do*). (Douglas et al. 1999: 163)

(70) *You need **not** be so vehement in expressing your dislike. (*Baillie 1821: 391)

3.1.7.4. The auxiliary do in negative clauses with ought to and used to

Ought to and *used to* have two options in negative clauses, i.e. the lexical verb construction (with *do*) - no examples found, and auxiliary construction (without *do*). (Douglas et al. 1999: 164)

(71) *...young women ought **not** to be*

    Married too early... (Baillie 1821: 401)

3.1.7.5. The auxiliary do in negative imperatives

During the period**s** of OE and ME the imperative verb preceded the subject. Such word order remained during the EModE period too. **(**Han and Kroch 2000)

(72) *Let **not** the royal bed of Denmark be*

    A couch for luxury and damned incest. (Shakespeare 1885:24)

However, imperatives with *do*-support could also be present.

(73) *Do **not** sleep, but let me hear from you. (*Shakespeare 1885: 17)

During EModE, an overt subject was optional. In an imperative with an overt subject with *do*-support, auxiliary *do* precedes the subject and in imperatives with an overt subject but without *do*-support, the verb precedes the subject. (Han and Kroch 2000) However there are no examples with such use found in Hamlet.

In PdE, negative imperatives are made by placing *do not* or *don't* before the verb, which means that the *do*-support is required.

Baillie (1821):	Stephenson (2002):
(74) ***Don't*** *shut the door yet.* (387)	(75) ***Don't*** *start this lark.* (3)
* *negative imperatives with* do not *are not found.*	* *negative imperatives with* do not *are not found.*

3.2. Late Modern English and Present-day English

The eighteenth century is marked by great developments in science and other fields of intellectual life; this was the period of the Enlightenment, in which the values of the classical world were accepted by social elites. These classical values were more like those of the Roman world, rather than the Greek or French world. All of this had a great impact on the development of the English language too. Standard Latin grammar was applied to English. The need for the standardization of the language appeared among grammarians during this period. Grammarians "engaged themselves in a number of battles in order to prescribe those language forms that were consistent with this basic idea, and to oust from the standard those that seemed to be opposed to it. Multiple negation was the ideal candidate to become the object of one such battle." (Mazzon 2004: 91) However, it has already been pointed out that multiple negation starts to appear rarer even much earlier than this period.

In order to give a detailed structure of the negative system in Late Modern English and Present-day English two plays are going to be used. The first one is taken from the early 19th century and the second one is taken from the early 21st century. These dramas and features of their negation

system are going to be analyzed together since there were no significant differences between them in relation to the periods when they appear, or it can be said that by 1776 the English language had already undergone most of the syntactic changes which differentiate PdE from OE. (Romaine 1997: 93) Romaine (1997:93) states that the English of 1776 was linguistically by no means the same as that of the present day with "relatively few categorical losses or innovations which have occurred in the last two centuries". However, reflections on some examples of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* are going to be included in this part, in order to show the changing history (i.e. differences and similarities) of the negative system over time.

Throughout this part of the paper two types of negation and their basic features will be mentioned. The first is called clause negation, i.e. the meaning of a whole clause is negative, and local negation (Quirk et al. 1980: 775), in which only a word or phrase is negative, not a whole clause. The distinction between clause and local negation lies in a distinction in scope, i.e. it concerns what portion of a sentence is actually negated. (Mazzon 2004: 96)

3.2.1. Clause negation

Clause negation has scope over the entire clause. It negates the meaning of a whole clause. Clause negation is expressed by *not* or its contracted form *n't*. It can also be expressed by using negative constituents such as *nobody*, *nothing* or *never* as well as other expressions such as *seldom*, *hardly*, *barely*, *little* or *few*.

3.2.1.1. Clause negation through verb negation

A simple positive clause is negated by inserting the negator *not* between the operator and the predication as it can be seen in the following examples:

Baillie 1821:	Stephenson 2002:
(76) *I could **not** be with him…*(367)	(85) *It might **not** please you…*(4)
(77) *I should **not** have used them:*(370)	(86) *I'm **not** entering the Olympics.*(37)
(78) *I would **not** have…*(374)	(87) *You're **not** going just yet Jack.*(97)
(79) *You need **not** be so…*(391)	(88) *He's **not** brathing…*(8)
(80) *I must **not** tell you.* (406)	

(81) *I **cannot** love them myself* (416)

(82) *I will **not** give it up!*(431)

(83) *...we might **not** be interrupted (452)*

(84) *I have **not** spared myself:* (431)

However, the negator *not* appears more usually in the enclitic contracted form *n't* (Quirk et al. 1980: 776), especially in the 21st century drama in which most of the examples contain this contracted form *n't*.

Baillie 1821:	Stephenson 2002:
(89) *We sha**n't** be the same...*(365)	(92) *...that wo**n't** change your life.*(4)
(90) *I ca**n't** say but ...*(368)	(93) *I have**n't** been to the cinema...*(13)
(91) *I wo**n't** suffer her to break...*(394)	(94) *You ca**n't** make as many good copies.*(15)
	(95) *I could**n't** work it out...*(22)
	(96) *...and it has**n't** harmed you...*(33)
	(97) *You must**n't** give anything away.*(68)
	(98) *I would**n't** know.*(69)

It can be seen through these examples that the operator is the first auxiliary verb. It can be either *be*, *have* or a modal auxiliary. There are three ways to realize an operator which is followed by *not*. The first one is its full form, as in (61) to (84), and the other two are its contracted forms. The contracted options are *not-contraction* and *operator contraction*. (Douglas et al. 1999: 165)

(99) *I'll **not** quit the neighbourhood.* (Baillie 1821: 384)

(100) *It's **not** actually funny.* (Stephenson 2002: 5) } *operator contraction*

(101) *I'm **not** blaming her.* (Stephenson 2002: 39)

(102) *It **wasn't** anyone's idea.* (Stephenson 2002:38)

(103) *I **wouldn't** say that.* (Stephenson 2002:35)   *not- contraction*

There are two special *not*-contracted forms of *shall* and *will + not*, i.e. *shan't* and *won't*

(104) *I **won't** suffer her to break in upon our tender conversation…* (Baillie 1821: 394)

(105) *I **shan't** faint.* (Baillie 1821:381)

However, if there is no operator in a positive clause, then dummy auxiliary *do* is introduced.

(106) *I **don't** know how it is, he gets on main well without, Sir.* (Baillie 1821: 368)

(107) *You **don't** want to hear these things, they'll make you despair.* (Stephenson 2002: 50)

Do not is usually used in its contracted form *don't* but if there is an example of uncontracted form, it is used mainly for emphasis.

(108) *I **do not** look upon my fellow-man with, the same gentle eye as thou dost:* (Baillie 1821: 416)

(109) *I **do not** presume to advise you;* (Baillie 1821: 437)

Be functions as an auxiliary and requires no *do*-insertion except for negative imperatives mentioned earlier in the paper.

(110) *…but he was not at home.* (Baillie 1821: 386)

(111) *I'm not stupid enough to think it was.* (Stephenson 2002: 82)

The form *ain't*, which applies to all persons, is found in the early 19th century play. In the following examples the form *ain't* is used by the author to represent the characters of lower social status.

(112) *I know very well I **ain't** so god as I should be…* (Baillie 1821: 370)

(113) *Why that **ain't** like him, neither.* (Baillie 1821: 447)

3.2.1.2. No-negation

Apart from being negated by inserting the negator *not* between the operator and the predication, clauses can be negated by other negative elements too. This can be seen in the following examples.

Baillie 1821:	Stephenson 2002:
(114) *I saw **nothing** in it but all about the great people at court.* (369)	(119) *But guilt is the most useless emotion, it's corrosive and inward looking and it gets you **nowhere.*** (50)
(115) *We have **nobody** to plead for us, and I cannot speak.* (383)	(120) *I haven't a clue. It's **neither.*** (32)
(116) ***Never** fear.* (388)	(121) ***Nobody** seems to know where she came from originally.*(48)
(117) *Say **no** more of this at present.*(466)	(122) *It's the **nothing** that turns my bowels to water.*(66)
(118) *I'll **neither** make **nor** meddle the matter.(365)*	(123) *...Jack, you're in **no** state for dancing.(98)*

3.2.1.3. The syntactic characteristics of clause negation

There are various syntactic characteristics that distinguish negative clauses from positive clauses. These are (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 223-4):

1. They can be followed by positive tag questions:

> (124) *It's **not** his birthday, **is it**?* (Stephenson 2002: 21)

2. They can be followed by negative tag clause, with additive meaning:

> No such examples found.

3. They can be followed by negative agreement responses:

(125) SHOLTO

*You're **not** going to run away again?*

ANA

***No**.* (Stephenson 2002: 29)

4. They can be followed by nonassertive items:

    (126) ***I cannot** suffer **any body,** man,*

        Woman, or child… (Baillie 1821: 464)

    (127) ***I can't** do it **anymore**.* (Stephenson 2002: 29)

3.2.1.4. Other types of clausal negation

3.2.1.4.1. Words negative in form and meaning

As it has been previously stated, clause negation can be accomplished by negating a clause element other than the verb. This is accomplished by means of *no* or *not*, or using some other negative words such as *none* or *never*. If we compare the following example with its interpretation we can see the difference between the verb negation and negation of some other element and sometimes the choice between these two is allowed. (Quirk et al. *1980: 778)*

(128) ***I am not** a man to stop short at such beginning as these…* (Baillie 1821: 399)

In order to accomplish clause negation, other element can be negated (i.e. *I am **no** man …*). However, the result of negating either the verb or some other word usually means a different scope of negation. This implies that their meaning is sometimes considered completely different.

3.2.1.4.2. Words negative in meaning but not in form

There are several words that are negative in their meaning but not in their form. In PdE, words negative in meaning but not in their form include some adverbs and determiners such as *seldom, rarely, scarcely, barely, hardly, little, few.*

(129) *Poor thing, she **scarcely** knows a cow from a sheep.*(Baillie 1821: 451);

(130) *Apparitions **seldom** visit people of low condition.* (Baillie 1821: 443)*;*

(131) *I **hardly** see from one year to the next.* (Stephenson 2002: 39)*;*

(132) ***Little** rest and **little** food must, I fear, have brought him very low.* (Baillie 1821: 368)*;*

*(133) O confound your **little** minute economy, ... (*Baillie 1821: 425)

These words can be used to accomplish clause negation if they reflect syntactic features of clause negation. (See 3.1.3.) If positioned at the beginning of a clause, they cause subject-operator inversion. The following examples contain these words and they reflect the syntactic features of clause negation, which means that the clause negation is accomplished.

(134) *I think I need **scarcely** give myself the trouble of writing any more to-day.* (Baillie 1821: 425);

(135) *I **hardly** ever get out of these days.* (Stephenson 2002: 19)

Also, adjectives, verbs and prepositions with negative meaning are usually followed by nonassertive items.

(136) *Don't let that man enter the house **anymore**...* (Baillie 1821: 423)

(137) *I never said **anything** about being a bit black.* (Stephenson 2002: 48)

3.2.1.4.3. Nonassertive items and negative items

Clause negation is usually followed by nonassertive items. The most frequently used nonassertive items are given in the table below.

NONASSERTIVE	NEGATIVE
any	no, none
either	neither
anything	nothing
anybody	nobody
anyone	no one
anywhere	nowhere
anyplace	no place

ever	never
anytime	no time
yet	_____
anymore	no more
any longer	no longer
at all	_____

It is possible that the combination of *not* and some of the nonassertive items can be replaced by negative words in the right column of the table. Such examples are provided below.

(138) *I do**n't** know **anything*** (Stephenson 2002: 4) = *I know **nothing.***

(139) *Do**n't** court those proud people **any more.*** (Baillie 1821: 432) = *Court those proud people*

    no more.

(140) *I ca**n't** do it **anymore.*** (Stephenson 2002: 29) = *I can do it **no more**.*

(141) *I do**n't** want to go **anywhere** else.* (Stephenson 2002: 52) = *I want to go **nowhere** else.*

(142) *It does**n't** say **anything** about being Welsh anywhere.* (Stephenson 2002: 53) = *It says*

    ***nothing** about being Welsh anywhere.*

(143) *You must**n't** give **anything** away.* (Stephenson 2002: 68) = *You must give **nothing** away.*

It is possible for negative clauses to be followed by more than one nonassertive item, as it is stated at the beginning of this section. This means that a nonassertive item can appear in all positions of assertive items in positive clauses. (Quirk et al. 1980: 782)

(144) *It does**n't** say **anything** about being Welsh **anywhere**.* (Stephenson 2002: 53)

3.2.1.4.4. Negative intensification

There are a lot of ways to influence the emotive intensification of a negative. This can be done by nonassertive forms of extent such as *at all*, *by any means*, *in the slightest*, *in the least*, *in any way*. (Quirk et al. 1980: 785)

(145) *You haven't talked to him about it **at all***? (Stephenson 2002: 24)

(146) *There is no-goodness **at all** in doing any thing for you.* (Baillie 1821: 391)

3.2.1.4.5. The scope of negation

The negative item can influence the occurrence of a nonassertive form only if the nonassertive form is within the scope of negation, i.e. "within the stretch of language over which the negative item has a semantic influence." (Quirk et al. 1980: 787) Determining the scope of negation in ShE is very difficult because the use of nonassertive forms was not standardized yet and double negation was still common in use. This means that some negators could appear to have a positive sense because they performed the function of nonassertive forms or sometimes the negator would not be repeated in a second clause because the second clause is completely negative. However, the complete loss of double negation and the standardized use of nonassertive forms lead to the determined scope of negation. The scope of negation extends from the negative item to the end of the clause but it doesn't have to include the adverbial placed in the final position. In a clause with the clause negator *not* or some other negative word which is positioned after the operator, adverbials occurring in a position before the negative usually lie outside the scope of negation. (Quirk et al. 1980: 788)

(147) *…a cripple in a family is <u>not easily provided for</u>.* (Baillie 1821: 374)

(148) *And we're <u>not actually direct descendants, Dad…</u>* (Stephenson 2002: 17)

The scope of negation usually starts with the negative word itself, so in the examples (147) and (148) adverbial is placed after the negative which means that it lies within the clause. However, in the examples (149) and (150) an adverbial is placed before the negative which means it is outside the scope.

 (149) *…for what you very probably <u>won't get</u>;* (Baillie 1821: 432)

(150) *It probably <u>won't work out</u>. (*Stephenson 2002: 23)

Also, if an adjunct is placed in its final position, it may or may not be outside the scope which can be seen in the following examples. The difference of scope reflects different meaning.

(151*) He ca<u>n't see you </u>at present.* (Baillie 1821: 386)

   He ca<u>n't see you at present.</u> (Baillie 1821: 386)

(152) *I could<u>n't work it out at the time.</u>* (Stephenson 2002: 22)

The difference of scope, shown in the previous examples, usually reflects complete difference of meaning. Disjuncts and conjuncts always lie outside the scope wherever they appear in a clause.

(153) *Anyway, I'm <u>not getting him one.</u>* (Stephenson 2002: 27)

(154) *Then you have <u>not read them</u> yet.* (Baillie 1821: 464)

(155) *However, I do<u>n't pretend to reason, Plausible:…</u>*(Baillie 1821: 386)

(156) *Actually, you did<u>n't say that</u>, I said it.* (Stephenson 2002: 60)

3.2.2. Local Negation

Contrary to clause negation, local negation negates a word or a phrase without making the clause negative. Local negation also extends its scope to its immediate right, excluding the verb either because the negated constituent is post-verbal or because is extra-clausal. (Mazzon 2004: 97)

There are various types of local negation. A common type of local negation is the combination of *not* with a morphologically negated gradable adverb or adjective. (Quirk et al. 1990: 228)

(157) **not un***easy* (Baillie 1821: 406)

(158) **not un***happy* (Baillie 1821: 432)

In these examples *not* negates the following word, not the whole clause. The basic aim of *not* is to change the meaning of the word which is already negative. So, such double negative phrases are devices of understatement (Quirk et al. 1980: 791), i.e. *not uneasy* has the positive meaning of 'being easy', or the meaning is somewhere between 'easy' and 'uneasy'.

Another type of local negation is the modification of degree adverbs by *not*. They in turn modify positive gradable adjectives or adverbs. (Quirk et al. 1980: 791)

(159) *I can't very well tell you: he has gone on…* (Baillie 1821: 372)

(160) *I am **not very** good with heat.* (Stephenson 2002: 52)

Adverbial expressions of extent in distance or time can be modified by *not*.

(161) *I know a poor ass, grazing on the common, **not far** off, that, to my certain knowledge, is*

    *foster-brother to a very great lor,…(*Baillie 1821: 366)

Comparatives *more, less* and *fewer* negated by *not* or *no* represent another type of local negation.

(162) *And give **no more** good things to Tony than the rest…* (Baillie 1821: 446)

The following examples represent the next type of local negation. Prepositional phrases can also be negated by a negative word. Prepositional phrases can function either as an adjunct or as a postmodifier of a noun.

(163) *…or ringing the church bell in the middle of the night, with **never a living creature** near*

    him but… (Baillie 1821: 414)

It is important to mention the use of the negative response *no*. It depends on whether it negates the implied or given statement:

(164) PRY

    … and I know very well, my lady, you'**re not** afraid.
    LADY SARAH
    No, I'**m not** afraid, but I don't know-how… (Baillie 1821: 443)

The following examples are used to show that the same answer can be given whether the previous statement is positive or negative. The use of *no* in the example (165) is determined by the speaker's disagreement with a previous speaker's statement. In contrast to this, the use of *no* in the example (166) reflects Jack's agreement with the previous statement, although the statement is negative.

(165) FATHER RYAN

    I see.

    JACK

    No you do**n't**. (Stephenson 2002:15)

(166) ANNA

    Dad doesn't like travelling.

    JACK

    No. (Stephenson 2002: 52)

In the case of *yes-no* questions, a response is based on "the truth value of the corresponding statement, the reponses coincide with an assertion (yes) or a denial (no) of its truth value." (Quirk et al. 1990: 791)

(167) ANNA

    Are you smoking in your flat?

    JACK

    No. (Stephenson 2002: 5)

3.2.3. Negative Connectives

It is possible to join two negative sentences without any connective or by using *and,* but in cases when two sentences have at least one element in common, it is usual to join them by means of negative connectives. In the list below two ideas are represented by A and B and they are being understood by the means of the positive c and negative nc, whereas nc^1 and nc^2 represent two different forms. According to Otto Jespersen there are seven types of negative connectives within A or B, i.e. two sentences (Jespersen 1917: 103):

1. nc A   nc B
2. nc^1 A nc^2B
3. nc A   cB
4. A   ncB
5. nA   ncB
6. nA nc^1B nc^2

7. nA   nB nc

In the first type there is a combination of two negative connectives. Most common examples of this type are the combination of *ne + ne* in OE; *nother + nother* and *nor + nor* in Shakespeare.

(168) *Sith **nor** th' exterior **nor** the inward man resembles that it was.* (Shakespeare 1868: 32)

The second type includes two different connectives, both negative. The most common examples of this type are *nother + ne*; *neither + ne*; and standard *neither + nor* which has become a formula in PdE.

(169) ***Neither** a borrower, **nor** a lender be; For loan oft loses both itself and friend…*

    (Shakespeare 1868: 17)

(170) *I'll **neither** make **nor** meddle in the matter.* (Baillie 1821: 365)

(171) *It's the children I'll feel sorry for, **neither** one thing **nor** the other.* (Stephenson 2002: 23)

The third type is completely different from the previous, because the second connective is in fact positive. This means that the negative connective in A is strong enough to influence the meaning in B. Examples of such type are combinations of *neither + or* whereas the use of *or* is not limited only to *neither*, but is also found with other negatives too.

(172) *For women fear too much, even as they love,*
    And women's fear and love hold quantity,
    *In **neither** aught, **or** in extremity.* (Shakespeare 1868: 58)

In the fourth type there is only one negative connective which affects both A and B and makes them negative. Examples of such type are *nor* without a preceding negative. No examples of such type were found in the dramas.

In the fifth type the negativity of A is indicated although not through a connective. On the other hand, a negative connective is used before B usually in the sense of *also* or *too*. Examples of this type are combinations of *not + neither*, *but + neither, never + neither, not + nor, never + nor*, etc. Instead of *neither* and *nor, no more* can be used too.

(173) ***No fairy takes, nor*** *witch hath power to charm…* (Shakespeare 1868: 6)

(174) *Taint **not** thy mind, **nor** let thy soul contrive…* (Shakespeare 1868: 24)

The sixth type differs from the fifth in that it has an additional negative connective placed after B. Examples of this type are combinations of *not + nor…neither*; *nothing + nor…neither* etc.

*(175) Man delights **not** me-no, **nor** woman **neither**…* (Shakespeare 1868: 40)

In the seventh type the connection between two sentences is achieved only after both sentences are fully expressed. This means that negative connective comes as an afterthought at the very end.

(176) HAMLET

    What man dost thou dig it for?

    1 CLOWN

    For no man, sir.

    HAMLET

    What woman, then?

    1 CLOWN

    *For none, **neither**. (*Shakespeare 1868: 100)

Today, *either* serves the function of an afterthought.

(177) *It's not New Age. It's not helpful **either**.* (Stephenson 2002: 10)

3.2.3.1. Nor and Neither

Nor and *neither,* both reflecting the feature of subject-operator inversion when introducing a clause, can be used as negative additive adverbs without being a correlative pair. (Mazzon 2004: 103) When used separately as negative adverbs, *neither* and *nor* have to follow a clause which is negative either explicitly or implicitly

(177) *I would not hear your enemy say so, **nor** shall you do my ear that violence…* (Shakespeare

    1868: 12)

(178) *He does confess he feels himself distracted. But from what cause 'a will by no means*

    speak. **Nor** *do we find him forward to be sounded.* (Shakespeare 1868: 48)

When used as a correlative pair, *nor* functions as a central coordinator, and *neither* as an 'endorsing item' whose position varies according to the scope of negation. (Mazzon 2004: 103)

(178) *It's* **neither** *dead* **nor** *alive.* (Stephenson 2002: 32)

(179) *I'll* **neither** *make* **nor** *meddle in the matter.* (Baillie 1821: 365)

3.2.3.2. Not…but

The negator *not* and its contracted form *n't* may be correlative with a following *but:* (Quirk et al. 1980: 940)

Shakespeare (1868):	Baillie (1821):	Stephenson (2002):
(180) *Pity me* **not, but** *lend thy serious hearing…*(22)	(181) *My poor mother used to say, that young women ought* **not** *to be married too early,* **but** *wait till they had sense to conduct themselves at* [sic] *the head of a family.* (401)	(182) *It might* **not** *please you,* **but** *it's indisputable.* (4)

3.2.4. Negative indefinite pronouns

One of the most important features of indefinite pronouns is that their meaning is general and nonspecific. Negative indefinite pronouns are *neither* and *none*, and compound indefinite pronouns are *no one, nothing, and nobody*. In addition to this, *few* and *little* are going to be mentioned although they are not morphologically negative but rather negative in their meaning.

Neither can also be used as a distributive numeral and as an conjunctive (additive) adverb (Poutsma 1916: 1126). Its use is restricted to a set of two people or things which makes it different from *none.*

(183) *JACK*

    Anyway, the cat's in the box. Locked in. It it alive or dead?

    ANNA

    I haven't a clue.

    SHOLTO

    *It's **neither.*** (Stephenson 2002: 32)

While *neither* is restricted to a set of two people or things, *none* applies to three or more people or things. In PdE *none* functions as an indefinite pronoun. As an indefinite pronoun it can be either in plural or singular with the meaning *not any* or *not one*, which is very difficult to distinguish. (Poutsma 1916: 1152)

(184) *O, but she loves **none of the rest;** She is as hard as a millstone to the other two.* (Baillie

    1821: 407)

(185) *When I first started teaching **none of the children** knew anything about sex.* (Stephenson

    2002: 73)

(186) ***Letters** by the post. I have received **none.*** (Baillie 1821: 466).

No one, nobody and *nothing* also function as indefinite negative pronouns used in singular. *No one* and *nobody* are personal pronouns whereas *nothing* is a nonpersonal pronoun.

(187) *I can see **nobody** now.* (Baillie 1821: 472)

(188) *There is **nothing** very wonderful in that, man.* (Baillie 1821: 364)

(189) *It's **nothing** to do with trees.* (Stephenson 2002: 4)

(190) ***No-one** said anything about particles being waves and cats in boxes.*

    (Stephenson 2002: 33)

(191) ***Nobody** seems to know where she came from originally.* (Stephenson 2002: 48)

Few and *little* can be used as indefinite negative pronouns although not negative morphologically but rather in their meaning , as it was said before. They can function both attributively following determiners like *the*, *those* or *what*, or predicatively. (Quirk et al. 1980: 392) However, in the following examples *little* functions as an adverb since examples of it functioning attributively and predicatively are not found in dramas.

(192) O my poor mother! **Little** did I think when I kissed your cold hands, that you would so

soon be forgotten. (Baillie 1821: 382)

(193) *I have no information for enabling me to judge of it: my mind has been **little** exercised in*

regard to the money-affairs of the world. (Baillie 1821: 453)

Examples of *few* functioning attributively or predicatively are not found in dramas either.

3.2.5. Negative questions

According to Quirk et al. (1980: 808), questions are divided into three classes according to the reply they expect, i.e. *yes-no* questions, *wh*-questions and alternative questions.

3.2.5.1. Negative yes-no questions

Yes-no questions are formed by placing the operator before the subject and if there is no element which can function as an operator, then *do* is introduced. *Yes-no* negative questions may contain negative forms of different kinds, which can be seen in the following examples:

(194) ***Doesn't*** *that make you think?* (Stephenson 2002: 13)

(195) ***Haven't*** *you got things to do?* (Stephenson 2002: 14)

(196) ***Can't*** *you ask a gentleman how he does….?* (Baillie 1821: 369)

(197) ***Are*** *you **not** well, Papa?* (Baillie 1821: 381)

 (198) ***Have*** *you **never** a mind to put a little money to advantage? And **has nobody** else called?*

(Baillie 1821: 398)

The orientation of a negative is considered rather complicated because it is influenced by the element of surprise or disbelief. The speaker hopes for a positive response, but within the question, it is suggested that the response will be negative. So, there is a combination of a positive (speaker's hopes) and a negative attitude (expression of disappointment). (Mazzon 2004: 105)

If a negative *yes-no* question is followed by a nonassertive form, it is directed toward negative meaning (199) in contrast to negative *yes-no* questions followed by an assertive form, which is then directed toward the positive orientation.(200)

(199) *MICHAEL*

  Haven't *you got **any** interesting new facts to tell me? (Stephenson 2002: 39)*
  JACK
  No. (Sephenson 2002: 39)

(200) PATRIA

  Couldn't *you have done **something**? You could have found out who he was, you could have,*
  I don't know, you could have.
  JACK
  I could have done all sorts of things. (Stephenson 2002: 80)

Another very interesting feature of negative *yes-no* questions is the position of the negative adverb. It can occupy three positions depending on whether the negative adverb is in its full or contracted form. If the negative adverb is in its contracted form then it is positioned before the subject: (Quirk et al. 1980: 808-9)

(201) ***Isn't*** it a great little flat you have here, Jack? (Stephenson 2002: 11)

(202) ***Won't*** you let me pick a caterpillar from your ribband? (Baillie 1821: 393)

If the negative adverb is in its full form then it can appear both before and after the subject.

(203) ***Have not*** I ears in my head? (Baillie 1821: 387)

(204) ***D'*** you ***not*** have house numbers in Barbados? (Stephenson 2002: 51)

(205) ***Are not*** *you going to write by return of post?* (Baillie 1821: 426)

3.2.5.2. Negative wh-questions

*Wh-*questions are formed with *wh-*words such as *who/whom/whose/what/which/where/how/why.* This type of question can also be negative:

(206) ***Why*** *you* ***don't*** *go to-day, aunt?* (Baillie 1821: 391)

(207) ***Why don't*** *you see me preparing, hussy?* (Baillie 1821: 439)

(208) ***Why didn't*** *you say?* (Stephenson 2002: 2*)*

3.2.5.3. Tag questions

The form of tag questions resembles the form of *yes-no* questions, in that it consists of an operator and a subject pronoun. The choice between these two depends on the statement. The most common types of tag questions are:

• positive statement-negative tag

(209) *It's been a great day, has**n't** it? (*Stephenson 2002: 95)

(210) *You have had a fine ride, and a long ride, have you **not?*** (Baillie 1821: 376)

• negative statement-positive tag

(211) *It's **not** my birthday, is it?* (Stephenson 2002: 56)

3.2.6. Affixal Negation

Negative elements which create negative contexts can also appear as part of lexical items. This happens with the affixation onto the lexical base of other elements that suggest negativity. The majority of these elements are prefixes since there is addition of a semantic, rather than grammatical nucleus. (Mazzon 2004: 111)

Among negative prefixes there are *a-* (no examples found) which is also used in a form of *an-* and both forms express 'lack of' and they are mainly found in learned vocabulary. Another very

important prefix which is combined with nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs and it is of Latin origin is *dis-*. Its use can be seen in the following examples:

(212) ***dis****inhabited* (Stephenson 2002: 21)

(213) ***dis****located* (Stephenson 2002:22)

(214) ***dis****tress* (Baillie 1821: 388)

(215) ***dis****agrreable* (Baillie 1821: 374)

The most important negative prefixes are *un-* and *in-* and both prefixes are reduced from the negative word *ne*. (Jespersen 1917: 139) *Un-* is originally an English form, while *in-* is Latin form, which in English came into use through Latin and French words.

(216) ***in****secure* (Stephenson 2002: 12)

(217) ***in****continence* (Stephenson 2002: 14)

(218) ***un****resolved* (Stephenson 2002: 30)

(219) ***in****finitely* (Baillie 1821: 405)

(220) ***un****known* (Baillie 1821: 419)

(221) ***un****easy* (Baillie 1821: 406)

(222) ***un****civil* (Baillie 1821: 418)

(223) ***un****equal* (Baillie 1821: 464)

The Latin form *in-* "has the alternate forms *ig-* i*m-, ir-,* and *ig-."* (Jespersen 1917:139) Those variants are usually found with adjectives of Latin and French origin.

(224) ***Il****legal* (Stephenson 2002: 50)

(225) ***im****possible* (Baillie 1821: 364)

(226) ***im****proper* (Baillie 1821: 382)

(227) *ir*responsible (Stephenson 2002: 97)

(228) *ir*rational (Stephenson 2002: 49)

(229) *ir*relevant (Stephenson 2002: 5)

Generally speaking, *un-* is typically used with short words whereas *in-* is usually used with long words. (Jespersen 1917:139)

(230) *un*known (Baillie 1821: 419)

(231) *in*hospitable (Baillie 1821: 423)

Another feature of these negative prefixes is that they are not used with verbs. Although the prefix *in-* is used exclusively with adverbs and adjectives, the prefix *un-* can be used with participles since they are adjectival.

(232) *In*continence pants (Stephenson 2002: 14)

(233) *in*estimable receipt (Baillie 1821: 426)

(234) ...*un*observed by them (Baillie 1821: 420)

Non- is another prefix which is frequently used in recent times especially in places where *in-* or *un-* are not available. Its early history is limited to its Latin origin and mostly to learned vocabulary but from the 17th and 18th century onwards it gained currency.

(235) *non*-swearing (Stephenson 2002: 59)

(236) *non*-offensive (Stephenson 2002:59)

(237) *non*-commital (Stephenson 2002: 59)

(238) *non*sense (Baillie 1821: 388)

(239) *non*sensical (Baillie 1821: 400)

There are some prefixes that are excluded from this section because of their double function, i.e. negative and reversative or privative. (Mazzon 2004: 112) Such prefixes are *mis-; mal-* and they

could be said to have a negative element but they also have the reversative function (Mazzon 2004: 112) which overlaps with their negative meaning. This is the case with the negative prefixes *dis-* and *un-* too but no examples are found in the plays.

The only suffix to be mentioned in this group is the suffix *–less*. It is used to form adjectives from nouns by adding the meaning 'without'.

(240) *hope**less*** (Baillie 1821: 373)

(241) *spirit**less*** (Baillie 1821: 376)

(242) *relent**less*** (Stephenson 2002: 64)

(243) *care**less*** (Baillie 1821: 395*)*

(244) *help**less*** (Baillie 1821: 413)

3.3. Analyses of the dramas

Table 1: *Not*

	Hamlet	*The Second Marriage*	*Mappa Mundi*
not after the verb	80	18	1
not before the verb	147	215	248
contracted form *n't*	0	105	224
do followed by the particle *not* preceding the main verb	38	101	185

Table 2*: Words negative both in meaning and form*

	Hamlet	*The Second Marriage*	*Mappa Mundi*
never preceding the verb	18	33	49
never preceding modal verbs	4	2	0
never in relation to the verb to be	1	1	3
nothing	30	23	14
no preceding a noun/an adjective	111	77	19
nay	23	15	0
none	13	3	1
nobody	0	13	3
no one	0	0	7
nowhere	1	0	3
neither	6	2	2
nor	36	0	0
neither…nor	5	2	2
multiple negation	7	0	0
not followed by an adjective or adverb with a negative prefix	2	4	0

Table 3: *Words negative in meaning but not in form*

Words negative in meaning but not in form	*Hamlet*	*The Second Marriage*	*Mappa Mundi*
seldom	0	3	0
scarcely	4	8	0
rarely	0	0	0
barely	0	0	0
hardly	0	0	2

These tables are used to show some aspects of negation through three different dramas and the course of its changing path.

Table 1 presents the number of examples of *not* relative to the main verb, the instances of the contracted form *n't* and the development of auxiliary *do* in negative sentences. It was mentioned earlier that *not* can be positioned after or before the main verb. The postion of *not* after the verb was usual in ShE but such use is rare in the 19th century drama. In the 21st century drama analyzed in the paper, only one example is found:

(245) JACK
D'you think you take after me?
MICHAEL
I hope not. (Stephenson 2001: 42)

As the number of examples with *not* after the verb decreases, the number of examples with *not* before the verb increases through the dramas taken from the three different centuries. The number of examples in the latter category includes examples with auxiliary *do*. The third category of Table 1 is very interesting since no examples of contracted form *n't* are found in Hamlet. This is due to fact that the appearance of the contracted form *n't* came within the standardization of English language. (Mazzon 2004: 104) One of the most important aspects of English syntax is the development of auxiliary *do*. Throughout the period of EModE there was a choice between negating with auxiliary *do* followed by *not* preceding the main verb, or negating

with the adverbial form *not* following the verb. In Hamlet, there are 38 examples of *do* followed by *not* preceding the main verb and 80 examples of *not* following the verb. On the other hand, the 19th century drama and especially the 21st century drama have greater number of examples where auxiliary *do* is followed by *not.*

It can be seen in Table 2 that a lot of negators or negative words such as *neither, nor, none, nothing, never, neither…nor…*etc, were present in all three dramas. However, not all negative words are found in all the three dramas but that does not mean that they didn't exist in previous periods. That is the case with *nobody* which appears in the second drama and continues its appearance in the third drama. Negative words *nowhere* and *no one* are only found in the third drama. Another very interesting aspect is the use of *nay* instead of *no* which can be found in *Hamlet*. Its appearance decreases in the second drama and completely disappears in the third. It has been already mentioned that the phenomenon of Multiple Negation means the use of two or more negative elements that do not cancel each other but are used to emphasize the negative meaning. Although the phenomenon was used up until the 18th century, examples of it are found in *Hamlet* as it can be seen in Table 2. The only case of double negation that is acceptable in Standard English is *not* followed by an adjective or adverb with a negative prefix. By looking at the analyses of this category in Table 2, one can see that there were 2 examples found in Hamlet, and 4 examples found in *The Second Marriage* whereas there were no examples in *Mappa Mundi.*

(246) *… it would be **no un**wise thing in me to follow your advice.* (Baillie 1821: 433)

(247) *But you must sit in the dark, and **not** be **im**patient.* (Baillie 1821: 443)

Table 3 shows that words negative in meaning but not in form were used rarely in all three dramas. The only example of *seldom* was found in *The Second Marriage* where it was used 3 times. There are 4 examples of *scarcely* in *Hamlet* and 8 in *The Second Marriage*. *Hardly* was used 2 times in *Mappa Mundi*. As for *rarely* and *barely* there were no examples found in any of the dramas.

4. Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to present the system of negation in ModE by looking at its previous periods, in order to become aware of the changing history of the negation system. During the period of OE, a simple pre-verbal clause negator – *ne* – was used, which over time has become reinforced by some other negative adverbs and finally replaced by *not*. Post-verbal *not* became well established in the structure during the ME period and additional changes appeared in the period of EModE, since the introduction of auxiliary *do* led to a new structure. However, the period of EModE still allows two options, i.e. post-verbal *not* and aux + negative + verb structure since auxiliary *do* was not yet fully established. Also, the periods of ME and EModE include the decline of multiple negation, new sentence structure and a lot of changes which made English negation become as it is today. The presentation of the negation system in EModE is followed by examples taken from *Hamlet*. These examples illustrate the features of English negation at the time, and they are used predominantly to show both differences and similarities with the present day situation.

However, a strong need for standardization of the language, followed by great developments and changes in science and other aspects of life, appeared in the 18th century. The rules and language norms established at the time helped lead to the system of negation which is known today. The complete loss of multiple negation reinforced by the use of nonassertive forms, the rise of auxiliary *do* which set the new word order, i.e. aux + neg. + verb, influenced the establishment of the standard system of negation.

The system of negation is viewed from two aspects, clause and local negation, which help us to be aware which portion of a sentence is in fact negative. Clause negation is achieved by inserting *not* between the operator and the verb or by negation of some other element (*no-negation*), whereas local negation is achieved by negating only a word or a phrase, not the whole clause. Features of both types are shown through examples from two plays from different periods (the 19th and 21st centuries). This paper deals with other aspects of negation dominant in ModE as well, such as negative questions and negative indefinite pronouns and their use too. Also, it provides a list of negative connectives and their change over time, as well as negative affixes which are used today.

Bibliography

Primary sources:

Baillie, Joanna. 1821. *A series of plays, VOL. 1.* London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown Peternoster-Row.

Shakespeare, William. 1868. *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark..* Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz. *2.*

Stephenson, Shelagh. 2002. *Mappa Mundi.* London: Methuen.

Secondary sources

Abbott, E. A., D.D. 1883. *A Shakespearian Grammar.* London: Macmillan and co.

Alexandar, L.G. 1988. *Longman English Grammar.* London and New York: Longman.

Barber, Charles. 1993. *The English language: a historical introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baugh, Albert C. and Thomas Cable. 1993. *A History of the English Language. Fourth edition.* London: Routledge.

Blake, N. F. 2002. *A Grammar of Shakespeare's Language.* Houndmills: Palgrave.

Blake, Norman. 1992. *The Cambridge History of English Language,Vol. 2: 1066 – 1476.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Douglas, B. Johannson, S. Leech, G. Conrad, S. & Finnegan, E. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English.* London: Longman.

Frisch, Stefan. 1997. "The change in negation in Middle English: a NEGP licensing account." Lingua 101. 21-64. ftp://ling.upenn.edu/facpapers/tony_kroch/papers/nels30.pdf [Accessed on August 3rd 2013]

Greenbaum, Sydney & Quirk, Randolph. 1990. *A Student's Grammar of the English Language.* Harlow: LongmanHan, Chung-hye & Kroch, Anthony. *"*The rise of do-support in English:

implications for clause structure." ftp://ling.upenn.edu/facpapers/tony_kroch/papers/nels30.pdf [Accessed on August 1st 2013]

Hogg, Richard M. (ed.). 1999. *The Cambridge History of English Language, Vol. 1: The Beginning to 1066.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jespersen, Otto. 1917. *Negation in English and Other Languages.* Copenhagen: B. Luno

Kallel, Amel. 2007. "The loss of negative concord in Standard English: Internal factors." Cambridge University Press.
http://www.researchgate.net/publication/231982463_The_loss_of_negative_concord_in_Standard_English_Internal_factors [Accessed on July 22nd 2013]

Lakoff, George.1966. "A note on negation." http://georgelakoff.files.wordpress.com/2011/01/a-note-on-negation-lakoff-1966.pdf [Accesed on August 3rd 2013]

Lass, Roger. 2000. *The Cambridge History of English Language, Vol. 3: 1476- 1776.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mazzon, Gabriella. 2004. *A History of English Negation.* Harlow: Longman.

Poutsma, H. 1916. *A Grammar of Late Modern English, Part II:* The Parts of Speech. P. Noordhoff.

Quirk, R. Greenbaum, S. Leech. G & Svartvik, J. 1980. *A Grammar of Contemporary English.* London and New York: Longman.

Romaine, Suzanne.1999. *The Cambridge History of English Language,Vol. 4: 1776: 1997.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tubau, Susagna. "Negative Concord in Standard English and the syntax-morphology interface." http://filcat.uab.cat/clt/ConsoleXVIII/tubau.pdf [Accessed on July 29th 2013]

Varela Pérez, José Ramón.1997. "The use of periphrastic do in Early Modern English negative declaratives: evidence from the Helsinki Corpus."
http://sederi.org/docs/yearbooks/08/8_4_varela.pdf [Accessed on August 3rd 2013]